

Lessons/Observations from Alturas Joint Evaluation
For GAP activities performed from 10/01/13 – 09/30/14

Tim Wilhite
01/20/2014

1. Some progress is reported more than once. It is not necessary (or desirable) to report the same progress in multiple quarters. The fourth quarter report does not need to summarize what was reported in previous quarters.
2. The deliverables associated with each commitment were not attached in GAP Online in all cases. All deliverables identified in work plans must be attached to reports. Please go through your report and attach all required deliverables.
3. All funds were spent, but not all work was completed. If some work is not completed, the EPA would expect that a proportional amount of funds are left unspent. The Tribe should not spend all grant funds unless all work is completed; the EPA has asked tribes to return funds for situations like that.
4. Reasons for not completing some commitments were not given and were not well forecasted. Tribes are expected to alert the EPA to situations when they will not be able to complete grant activities. If commitments are not completed, tribes are expected to explain why.
5. The status of commitments is not correct in all cases. Pit River completed some tasks that are still identified as being on schedule. Please go through the report and correct the status of commitments where applicable.
6. In 3.1, quarter 1, progress is characterized as “this task is still in process.” That statement is too vague. If work was accomplished under the commitment, the work should have been described. If no work was accomplished, the Tribe should indicate so. There may be more areas of the report like this, but I pulled this one out to highlight a particular type of reporting deficiency and to indicate where improvements can be made in the future.
7. A TEP was not completed as promised (see 3.1). It appears the Tribe may have wanted to change the scope of the commitment to “developing an IRMP.” However, an IRMP was not completed either. This example provides several lessons; a) if Pit River wants to change the scope of a commitment, they should request the change in writing and modify affected commitments (if the modifications are approved) accordingly, b) the inability to complete this task could have been forecasted a little better, and c) funding for this commitment should conceivably have been left in the grant, and d) the EPA could have discussed the issues with this commitment in a more timely fashion and helped the Tribe make work plan or reporting adjustments. PS... Marissa found a good copy of Pit River’s TEP and will be making necessary refinements to it by November 7, after which she will attach the document into GAP Online.
8. In 4.1, Section 106 consultations are mentioned. According to Marissa, the term was used very generically and was not meant to imply GAP funds were used for cultural preservation consultations. In that case, the reference to section 106 consultation should be removed from the report.
9. The EPA did not discuss each quarterly report with the recipient, but should strive to do so in the future. That habit/action would probably prevent most of the issues identified in this end of year process.

10. The EPA did not provide feedback on the Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan Rule refined. Although the ISWMP was not a commitment for the work plan being addressed in this joint evaluation, we mention the issue here so we don't forget to follow-up on it in the near future.